



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,080	12/19/2001	Charles Lee Edwards	TH1647 (US) YI:EM	8290

7590 05/19/2003
YUKIKO IWATA
c/o SHELL OIL COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
P. O. BOX 2463
Houston, TX 77252-2463

EXAMINER	
SAEED, KAMAL A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1626	
DATE MAILED: 05/19/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/025,080	Applicant(s)	EDWARDS ET AL.
Examiner	Kamal A Saeed	Art Unit	1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- The period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Disposition of Claims

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) § . 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 54 are pending in this application. Claims 5-54 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The withdrawn subject matter is patentably distinct from the elected subject matter as it differs in structure and element and would require separate search considerations. In addition, a reference which anticipates one group would not render obvious the other.

Response to Restriction

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-4, drawn to a branched alcohol composition, and the species of Example 1, $\text{HO} \backslash \text{CCCCOCCCCCC}$, *3-dodecyloxy-1-propanol*, recited on page 37, line 25, of the specification, in paper No. 10 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Therefore, the restriction requirement in paper No. 2 is still deemed proper and is made FINAL.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicants preserve their right to file a divisional on the non-elected subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections, set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Applicants a composition comprising a branched ether primary alcohol, wherein the total number of carbon atoms in the alcohol range from 9-24.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hozumi et al, US 4,544,512.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Hazumi et al, teach ether primary alcohol compound, that are analogous to the compounds of the formula depicted in claim 1, wherein R_1 represents hydrogen, R_2 represents a hydrocarbyl radical having one carbon atom and x is 11 or 12.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

One of the difference between the claimed compounds and that of the reference herein lie in the selection of substituents of the chain i.e., R_2 is methyl in the instant claimed compounds while Hazumi et al compound is hydrogen (See US '512, column 13, Example 1 and column 15, Example 5). The claimed compounds are so closely related structurally to the compounds of the reference as to be structurally obvious, in the absence of any unobvious ness or unexpected properties. There is no record in the application, which shows any unexpected activity of the methyl compounds over the hydrogen compounds of the reference. It is well established that the

substitution for hydrogen on a known compound is not patentable modification absent unexpected or unobvious results. In re Wood, 199 U.S.P.Q. 137 (C.C.P.A. 1978) and In re Lohr, 137 U.S.P.Q. 548, 549 (C.C.P.A. 1963).

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP §2142-2413)

One skilled in the art would expect that the instant claims which are analogs to the Hazumi compounds i.e. H vs Me, *prima facie*. The motivation to make claimed compound derives from the expectation that structurally similar compounds are generally expected to have similar properties. In re Gyurik, 596 F. 2d 1012, 201 USPQ 552 (CCPA 1979). The explicit generic teaching of Hazumi et al together with the enabled examples with variations in **the length of carbon chain** would have motivated one skilled in the art to modify the known compounds with such generic teaching with the expectation that they would all have similar activity as taught by Hazumi et al.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kamala Saeed whose telephone number is (703) 308-4592. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (703) 308 4537. The unofficial fax phone for this group are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and " Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Communication via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2286.

Kamala Saeed, Ph.D.,
May 14, 2003

joseph mckane for:

Celia C. Chang, Ph.D.,
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1